

Mark McGoldrick
290 E Phillips Lake Loop Rd
Shelton WA 98584

425 Third Street SW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024

To: Management

I appreciate your sending me a membership renewal and I believe you are a fine organization and are doing great work in your mission. Unfortunately, due to what happened last year with my life I am no longer able to donate or participate. I am severely disabled now. I was almost ready to re-enter the workforce when the crisis started. The fear and uncertainty caused great damage and distress within my family and has weakened me emotionally, financially and subsequent 'treatment' damaged me irreparably. I no longer have the resources to support your mission. All I have left is my observations, opinions and experience over the last few years in both society and as a person, a person who could ill afford the sequence of events. I joined your organization because I was almost recovered and was optimistic about the future. In my situation there is no adequate help for a person that needs financial, legal, medical and societal support at a level that would not provide an adequate cost benefit to society. That being said I endeavor to still be a good American and offer what observations I can make on your organization and possible things to improve on and consider. I hope this humble offering is useful or at least provides some ideas.

I thought long and hard about whether it might be arrogant for me on the one hand to say that I cannot afford to support you financially at this point at the same time as to waste your time on a long winded political opinion and analysis that would cost your organization time and resources. I have no success in life that justifies my right to even have an opinion, I am on disability and more of a drain on society than I could ever be of benefit to. I guess I should have been a politician! That would be funny if it was not true. This is no time for humor and I will say that many years ago when Ross Perot ran for president, the jokes and deflection away from the original and authentic America first agenda shows today could have been avoided if people were not manipulated away from thinking for themselves. Politics should not be a marketing exercise but it has become an increasingly necessary evil. It is more important to remove the necessity. We have a whole industry of political pundits, reporting, humor and analysis and lots of players that interpret, complicate and confound the general public and call themselves 'useful'.

This pandemic has laid bare the problems with the healthcare in our country. This has led to more medication and less thought, leading to more sales and more government debt. More is spent on treating than diagnosing which leads to wrong treatment or misdiagnosis altogether. The recent mass resignation of healthcare workers is not just due to workload and pay, it is due to the whole nature of the care and billing and accounting for that care. Paperwork generates revenue and delays independent diagnosis with a drop down list to help physicians to narrow choices that will provide the most revenue for the facility with the least amount of time.

Physicians that consider outside the establishment treatments are tracked, challenged and disciplined and accounting functions of hospitals and medical facilities limit the full application of their knowledge and skill. This respects no one, least of all the one seeking care. The ACA ended up being what it was

named, "Affordable Care Act" but not in the way most might think. It is not affordable, nor care but is an 'Act' in their play of lining the pockets of the accountants and statistical crowd as well as the information technology space.

Honestly there has to be a better way. Not being as knowledgeable as one could be I am left with only opinions and reasoning. Having no safe place to debate the larger issues leads to emergency sensationalist management and legislation.

Haste makes waste and Washington has no time or patience. This is dementia on steroids, they 'felt' great but they don't remember what day it is.

Legislation was not supposed to be about slogans, opinions, objectives and outcomes. The founding documents were short and well thought out and debated for more than an hour per page. This was absent technology, electricity and complications of modern life. A comparison could be made to the great pyramids, all the technology today could not replicate that feat. It seems the skills that lead to the construction of the founding documents are just as elusive to our elected officials.

It is not a mystery why. It takes time and effort to create a good plan of any sort. Assembling a long document with thousands of experts, evidence and ideas ensures clarity will be lost, complication will be increased and shoddy workmanship will be evident, resulting in legal challenges, the army of bureaucrats to administer and interpret how to follow the law and more confusion than existed before the legislation was passed. The real issue is akin to a product without a manual. The constitution is the manual but the last constitutional convention was so long ago as to render interpretation of modern legislation confusing and subject to administrative influence and loss of legislative intent. This is the real 'kicking the can' down the road and is the root of most modern problems.

It took a lot of time and work to be almost recovered and functional. I did not have the luxury of kicking the can down the road and had to do the hard work with my health providers and in my own life. I was not in a position to handle the stress of hyperactive leaders or deceptive experts. I did what I thought was right and spent a considerable time drafting and sending suggestions to the White House trying to do my part. I even made the suggestion to contact dryer sheet manufacturers to produce masks. I had no idea how to solve the problem in my small world. This circus leads to permanent damage to vulnerable people and society in general.

The whole logic behind passing any new legislation of any sort is not logical. The whole idea that a shared suffering unifies the world against one or any issue is in old terms 'smoke and mirrors'. The very people who benefit and have benefited were not impacted at the same level as the less fortunate.

Now the solutions will save the planet? What does that matter if millions of people's lives end up lost. I hate to be dramatic but there was a plan for a master race, and now the world has a plan for a master mentality. Great society is not so great. And billionaires and politicians did not become successful through individual effort, they did so through scale. The problem is scale. If all the billionaires avoid taxes by creating NGO's disguised as charities or 'foundations' then it is a competition for scale of a 'master plan'.

This is a new form of organized societal control, with a lot of hyper-educated and hyper-competitive people creating hypertext hyperbole and catchy phrases for complex drugs, complex diseases, complex problems and complex solutions that scale for individual problems is itself a problem. Everything has to be short, memorable and tirelessly repeatable: hope, change, covid, ceiling, debt, etc. Small scale

experiments created the largest breakthroughs in society from individuals. Our country was founded with a small experiment.

We have millions of small experiments that never make 'scale'. They are absorbed by the already scaled companies, fighting against each other to buy the small experiments before they can become a challenge. That is why we have less than four major competitors in most of our industries. Scale is everything.

If it was about making people whole, then anyone who was in cash for safety throughout the last 13 years since the bailout should be repaid for interest lost due to inflation and asset appreciation. It is a simple thing that seniors with traditional IRA's and savings accounts should be reimbursed for negative yields during that period if they are still alive. Prior to the great recession, which was neither great nor a recession, interest rates were higher than real inflation. After the 'reset' captive seniors had to either take high risk late in life or downsize, just as affordable care became neither affordable nor care. It became care of 'scale'.

Risks were mitigated and passed on to the taxpayer and growth artificially replaced rationality. Banks were bailed out and to this day pay little for capital due to supportive liquidity. If you force people to take unnecessary risks and reward risk and punish safety it is essentially defunding the police in financial terms. Loads of regulations, capital requirements and stopgaps and guarantees make the appearance of safety while inflation or more accurately currency destruction or dilution steals from prudent people locked into 'safe' tax advantaged accounts. This lowers tax revenue when distributions are taken from lower aggregate amounts which compounds the insult to both the population and the deficit. Add to that the prescription drug prices for the elderly you have effectively lowered the standard of living for millions of people in the middle, being too well off for benefits and too small for government to care. The point is not about individual situations, it is again about scale. It costs more to market votes to seniors and they do not have the lifespan to be a good investment. This is the scale equation which leads to the shifting of the older economic middle class to the lower class. Making the dependent more so with more reliance of the disinterested third party. Degrees of separation and stringent regulations about conflict of interest only bloat the structure. Rather than public servants or elected officials what we have is enablers strapped between the real needs of the populace and the lack of income for the plans they support.

Last time I checked, seniors with net worth of less than one million, excluding primary homes could use and extra \$10,000 far more than a tax credit of the same amount for an electric car. They should not have to subsidize future generations' aspirations with their decreasing time, advancing age and declining health. Just long term care for a month costs more than that. So you are forcing them to pay for medicare, supplemental care coverage, long term care coverage, taking their rightful interest on not having practical use of their money and taxing them on distributions. Not only is that more important than 'the environment' it is an actual crime. A legal scholar could argue elder abuse because their financial fear and stress beyond their control is abuse. Financial abuse it is. In real terms the government has a fiduciary responsibility and constitutional legal obligation to them.

13th Amendment

Section 1

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall

have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Honestly the Federal Reserve, the Treasury and the Congress has made seniors of lesser means slaves to their system. Slaves to the government they paid into and trusted.

If capital gains can be taxed, then capital destruction should be restored. Actually it is at the higher levels of the banks. Too big to fail is the reward that banks received, and too small to succeed is what that generation had to suffer. If your bank balances in your IRA and other non-risk post tax cash was impacted by printing of money then we are rewarding irresponsible behavior, all while punishing captive capital. The net effect is that lower distributions as a result of lower interest leads to lower tax revenue and higher deficits. Of course that leads to higher levels of need for economic support of those affected which also raises the deficit, which leads to the tax and divide strategy of the left and anyone in any party that allows this to happen. Stop gaps and more subsidies do nothing to give dignity to those who have to suffer less choice, delayed care and a near monopoly in most rural areas. This costs the federal government more and gives seniors less.

Reparations for seniors does not mean medicare reform, it means dignity through choices. We do need to turn back the clock. End of life is expensive due to out sized inflation in healthcare, which is caused by the government single payer system and the complicated reporting and billing systems. Less choice leads to higher costs.

A good example is fast food, cheap and plentiful for some, expensive for society. Now we have fast food that is no longer cheap and healthcare that is becoming faster while becoming more expensive.

All kinds of technical innovations, leading to ransomware cutting off health providers from their magical systems. My old doctor put everything in writing, still does. He's healthier than me and a lot smarter. Hard to hack a piece of paper.

Even the supposed non-partisan CBO has an accounting basis based on future assumptions and models. Last I checked, assumptions are not facts. I can really say from my weak and pathetic life that I have no actual right to waste people's time with my opinions but I will, given historically speaking an argument can be made that there is a better way to approach this.

Each person has an individual problems. It leads to unrealistic expectations and lofty ideals in place of individual effort. It rewards scale over substance and results over effort. Some will fail, but people who made honest attempts should not be put in a financial prison at the end of life.

The electorate and the entire world is sold on the idea that after a crisis, it is important to push forward with changing everything. If world leaders are in agreement then citizens should be suspect. The unifying common principal between cooperation and collusion is agreement. The agreements that have been put forward lately are about a common theme, while ignoring the problems that have yet to be fixed.

Any bill that is introduced, affects many other bills and laws that are already on the books. Adding amendments, revisions with a top line driving the bill rather than the programs that exist being fixed is a bill that is doomed to fail even with the best intentions. Our founders created guiding principles that led to the founding of this nation and the documents that were created to explain how the system was designed.

Imagine the founders and their thinking of 'infrastructure' and how they might approach that. The first feat would be to define exactly what infrastructure is. They would have likely spent a lot of time actually defining specifically what the objectives were after the definition. They then would create articles to form consensus what is agreed upon in terms of objectives.

There is no declaration of what infrastructure is or what it means in this time. Everything has a qualifier that is essentially a modifier. Human infrastructure, climate infrastructure, education infrastructure, etc. That is not a reasoned approach nor useful and can be universally misunderstood and characterized. It can, however, be sold to the widest audience with the least expensive method both politically and publicly.

When a press secretary says that we need not dumb down a subject that should be telling. Understandably, the green new deal preserves the global banking system and creates a new accounting authority to hide the real inequities of the citizenry. This, again is kicking the can down the road. It may work, as it has for the past 14 years but it leaves more risk and less reward for all but the most gains to the least number of people.

The very process of creating an initiative has become an accounting exercise and a codification of spending rather than what it should be which would be to define one issue at a time. If it takes multiple administrations and parties to do it right that would lead to a better result, especially when an emergency is feigned because of prior inaction. Many members of the congressional bodies have been there long enough to be completely responsible for the delay.

I would say, if you kicked the can down the road, you should pay for the mess you created. A good question when they talk about taxing the rich, is how long you have been in congress and how much the deficit has increased against your personal wealth. If you taxed the increase in congressional members wealth during their time of service against the deficit increase you could just give them the deficit. This should be true of all parties going back to 1990. If one faction wants to pull down historical statues that they do not like today, then the logical conclusion to the deficit and interest statue is to tear down the people that erected it, namely the federal reserve with the help of Congress and the White House.

It is understood that radical change would be a worse situation than anyone can imagine, but there has to be value gained in thoughtful debate. Trillion dollar moon shots to cover up millions of destitute Americans that have been damaged by modern 'progress'. All the well off technocrats can just get off the train and move to a smaller community, raise real estate value there and afford it.

Honestly we cannot afford their economy of scale.

Right now we are short truckers. Right now there are many companies developing self driving vehicles. What happens when that is allowed? Why would anyone want to work when their job is outsourced, robotized or will get too old to keep up with technology. We need no new deals, when we haven't even honored the ones we made to the ones who came before us.

If infrastructure and climate are the flavor of the day then fixing the broken and partisan legislative process is the first infrastructure that should be fixed. The infrastructure that caused the problems with infrastructure neglect and concentration of wealth are the last people regardless of party to fix the problem.

This contention could be backed up by a societal example of partisan, special interest and influence in Washington in regards to regulation and oversight by contrasting a couple of events historically that many may not remember.

The internet would not have evolved the way it did in any way had it not been for inattention to infrastructure and oversight of regulatory agencies. Ma Bell was broken up by antitrust laws and so the individual taxes on telephone customers collected by the independent baby bells for repair and reinforcement were not spent on that at all, leading to inadequate phone lines and relegating the majority of the internet to cable companies. Since the cable companies were not regulated in terms of monopolistic practices and subsequent overcharging of customers that resulted in Comcast (Xfinity) making enough money to buy NBC Universal and expand their monopoly. Competitive environment or not, the overpricing by the natural monopolies led to the problems we have today.

Smaller cable companies and natural monopolies in rural areas do not build out their networks absent federal subsidies.

There is no rational explanation to subsidize electric vehicles with a tax credit. Subsidizing companies and allowing them economies of scale while the buyers end up with a false economy, subsidizing the buyers and the companies at the same time. What if you cannot use the tax credit?

In what world does a tax credit help level the economic playing field? These are not cheap or uncomplicated products, you are not lowering the deficit and you are creating artificial subsidies to those that do not need it. Last I checked there is plenty of private equity, and plenty of deficit created from the capital accumulation caused by the ability of billionaires to create 'foundations' that avoid taxes and create a NGO 'extra' vote. People who buy electric cars that lower tax revenue by avoiding gas taxes and costing those that do not want to or cannot afford additional taxes. You are shifting costs from those least able to afford it right now to the economical benefit of those that are most able to afford it. When many of the oligopolies, with their attorneys, lobbyists and influence bought all their competition before they became relevant and were allowed to continue with a 'speeding ticket'. The deficit and inflation could be called 'infrastructure' and each tax credit that subsidizes the real cost of something that requires everybody to give up what they already paid for in favor of what they can no longer afford.

It forces people to 'buy now and pay later'. Anyone who has bought a cell phone, computer or other technology item in the last 15 years knows that they are all obsolete by the time you learn to use them.

I do understand it supports jobs and that is important. But a federal subsidy for gasoline is offset by the federal gas tax and the state gas tax. If you subsidize electric cars it leads to a mileage tax and an additional electricity energy tax. This will not end well. It will end up with a state mileage tax and a federal one. So if you go from one state to another, your cost per mile changes. Oh, the government has an app for that, tied into your cell phone! Just like carbon taxes are about lowering choice and raising control. Honestly, what if there is a blackout or power outage? If it takes weeks or months to restore power after hurricanes, how long will it take if there is a grid failure. I suppose you could have a battery 'tanker'. How about some software problem or exploit. We found out this already with healthcare and pipelines with recent ransoms paid. How about disabling millions of cars at once? Really? Risks versus rewards.

Our government gave loans to electric vehicle startups without equity clauses. In the real world,

venture capitalists charge an equity stake for risk they take on. The government taking on risk and getting no equity stake or future proceeds does not work out well for the taxpayer. Several electric vehicle startups went bankrupt yet Tesla paid off their loan from the government with a secondary stock offering. That is how incompetent our government system is. If anyone really reflects on the people that did paperwork surrounding those loans they should lose their jobs and pensions. The SEC allowed a secondary offering just to raise capital to pay off government sponsored debt. So the American taxpayer has to pay for the losses that add to the deficit for the unsuccessful loans but get no benefit for the successful ones. It might make sense but it doesn't pay the deficit.

The only reason I decided to send this anyway is to show that your efforts are supported, that some people do think deeply and care but are not in a position to change anything.

With the FOIA requests your organization has made to uncover corruption and try to increase transparency and accountability there is perhaps a wider net that could be cast. Administrative state arguments or characterizations could be accurate but in my humble opinion what needs to be known to help our government and wider society is who had what information and when; and how that was disseminated to the public and when as your organization has done before.

Timelines are important to show a pattern that is easily understood by the public. My opinion is the right harping on the same issues repeatedly and providing evidence of the issues does little to convince people outside of the right. Facts may support the assertions but outside of their circle mistrust of their motives is likely. A similar pattern on the left exists except that behavior is characterized as personality flaws and outright moral disgust. It is understandable to cater to one's viewership, group or affiliation but that does little in the way of advancing the entire population and further divides us. It is understandable, given that one line can lose an election and evidence is clear that bipartisan compromise is often used against the person who compromised.

A unifying principal that everyone can understand can be hijacked by identification of a common term such as equity and equality and even such terms from a legal standpoint have many different usages. Your organization is uniquely positioned to reorient itself in a more universal way that could benefit society.

An example was the continuous changing of scientific and health guidance in 2020 and around the time of the election and afterward. The NIH, FDA, CDC and other governmental agencies issued often contradictory statements which led to greater confusion amid the pandemic. Did the science change the message or did the message change have another intention or causation? In my opinion a FOIA request to internal documents regarding number of cycles used in PCR tests and whether that guidance was changed and how those measurements were made and in what areas. This information would be as important as voter rolls to validate whether any agency, individual actor, official or elected representative acted outside of chain of command and unduly influenced or abused their position or power.

It has been reported that different areas had different testing cycles numbers and thresholds in different areas at different times. That alone introduces reporting errors and exposes conflicts of interest. It is well known that hospitals got paid differently for Covid patients versus other illnesses. That can lead to reporting bias that was based on a financial incentive. The question to find out is why and whether there was a reporting bias to increase or decrease number of cases and mortality rate in any of those scenarios. If anything changed over time in terms of reporting, number of cycles used and there could be a statistical inference that might indicate a basis for further information requests that would clarify

for the American people whether this pandemic was used to political advantage and who benefited. It could also show, most importantly, improvements that can be made in the future especially around transparency, accuracy and timeliness of information. This is better numerically explained than statistically shown. More important to show polls versus disease timeline and area. I made a casual observation that it seemed every week both sides exploited the numbers in a political game of gotcha. Really?

The argument that has been made is that as more is known guidance is changed. It is most important to know what 'vetting' of this information was made, when and why and if the process for both verification and uniformity of message was influenced by people outside the chain of command. If decision makers and leaders were misled or otherwise given information that would have likely led to different decisions by elected officials that should be known.. Especially as it could have led to improper conclusions and therefore less than ideal decisions. The chain of command is legal and each position in the chain has a legal position description as is required of all federal jobs whether created by administrative procedure or legislation.

For instance, was our leadership informed incorrectly or given confusing and contradictory information? Even highly intelligent, well meaning leaders can be led astray by scientific consensus that later proves otherwise. Take climate change. As the political climate changes, so does the scientific method. This is not to predict correctness of the future, but the same economic models and theories that led to 2008 were based on assumptions that proved to be false, and are now even more widely used and called modern monetary theory.

Even if malice, collusion or illegality is proven, responsible individuals held accountable and linkages proven there is a more important way to present this to accomplish your mission and serve the public.

It would be my contention that identifying the structure and pathways that allowed those problems to arise in the first place would expose the risks of the administrative state. By identifying key roles that form the linkage that allow the very corruption and problems in government those positions could be eliminated, or authority chain changed. Having individuals fired or jailed does not solve the potential for further problems if the governmental position and its power and influence is maintained as it was.

If a dangerous road or intersection causes a safety issue resulting in crashes, the remedy is not to repave the same road in the same way. The intelligent solution is to eliminate or mitigate the hazard. When a moral hazard becomes a societal hazard things end up as they are today with the goal being convincing the people in danger that another subject requires more attention and to ignore the current problems and push ahead to solve new problems. It used to be called bait and switch. Currently there is a new term for it and there will be another, I gather.

My wider opinion is that too big to fail should not have lead to the situation in our country that is currently to small to succeed for the majority of the low end of society, especially older and less affluent people. I believe, in that light 'too important' to fire in government should not exist.

Many in our society, especially politicians operate on false assumptions that past solutions and methods solve current problems. Past lessons are ignored in favor of moving forward or changing course. A good example was the assumption that economic growth in China would encourage political change. The lesson was not learned, leading to the recent example of the assumption of cutting corporate tax rates leading to employment gains. Corporations did hire more, but the majority of the tax cuts went to stock buybacks, essentially increasing economic power and control of the most successful and largest

asset holders. The initial problem is not the rate or treatment at all. The problem was monopolistic and monopolistic competition and non enforcement of monopolistic and unfair competitive practices which are illegal. This has been the problem with the technology industry since the 1990's and just as it is with the deficit, the can is kicked to the next generation.

In this climate, with all these capital experts, they can just unwind or spin-off some of their monopolies or oligopolies, rename or re brand them. Agencies should not have not allowed this to happen in the first place.

The other false assumption is that modern monetary theory has worked so far. Artificial liquidity raises asset prices such as homes and advantages taxing authorities and raises inflation.

Lax oversight of existing securities agencies and their enforcement of securities laws and rampant corruption and collusion within the financial industry is a congressional responsibility. They have oversight and legislative authority. New legislation and rules introduced without enforcement of existing rules only advantages those with the biggest pockets for the penalties. For instance, when futures markets are manipulated as they were by JP Morgan last year, there was a \$920 million fine which was far less than they saved using manipulation which would have led to a substantial loss in excess of the fee. In this instance, investors were harmed by distorted prices on silver. Investors were harmed while JP Morgan mitigated their loss at the cost of the entire market while ensuring their cycle of control over those markets was not lost. Again the natural market, that is regulated allowed not only a false price, it also led to a subsequent supply shortage and knock on effects throughout the mining industry. If Judicial Watch can find what it has in the past in other areas, then there may be a request that can lead to uncovering reforms and accountability that needs to be addressed in the financial industry. I do understand that if precious metals rise quickly, that would disadvantage the paper market and probably cause another paper recession, which politicians would use as an excuse for another bailout. After 2008 I doubt Americans would back adding trillions of dollars to bailout paper producers.

The logical argument to your patrons and subscribers would be to lobby congress to hold agencies accountable that are not functioning correctly and to demand accountability of their oversight duties, not as a measure of political theater, but as a matter of law. This is probably not likely because most of congress does not hold themselves accountable.

Another area to research could be to determine if decision makers were given false or misleading information on therapeutic possibilities and progress while pushing for vaccine advancements or inflating progress in one area adding to potential confirmation bias within the leadership structure. Of course congress has oversight authority of those agencies but Judicial Watch can be pivotal in areas of administrative law and authority in terms of identification of issues within the structure leading to biased or bad information in such a way as to present oversight bodies with the duty to act on that information. As many in the oversight community know of these internal structures and biases it forces transparency upon them and makes them accountable if they do not address those issues. This could unify both parties and give a shared objective to root out corruption as well as allowing individuals within the structure to have to compete with each other to 'investigate'. In simplistic terms it gives every representative a morally defensible 'witch hunt'. The party that finds the most corruption wins and so do the American people. During this process innovations can be introduced. When President Trump issued the directive that for every new regulation, more had to be eliminated it was popular across the entire electorate because it made sense to them. Unfortunately being right or having good ideas is not enough. You have to have universally humble leaders with fierce spirit, rather than what

we have had.

Right now the whole idea of thousands of pages of new spending ideas and plans that will be administered by the same governmental agencies that have not spent efficiently in the past nor managed programs well is probably not a good idea, popular or not.

The previous administration brought issues to light that were not widely known before. In doing so, there was not a cohesive plan to actually deal with the unintended effects. What would anyone in the opposition side do? The notion that this is a republic 'if we can keep it' is more akin to the idea that acting like a bull in a glass shop leaves a lot of sharp objects around. This republic is fragile and must be handled with care.

In such a divided situation a common purpose gives both sides a chance to save face so as to potentially cause a pause in the current inability of either party to find common ground. It would also create a real competition between members and threaten the ever increasing governmental size and complexity.

Honestly it would give the congress something other than attacking each other in a zero sum game. It is doubtful that that would be the outcome given the participants on both sides but it might shift the conversation in way way that the public will look at the larger issues.

The larger public has complicated lives and little time to think about these issues. The problems that are touted are not the real problems. It might provide the opportunity to lay bare the individuals If these doctors, scientists and researchers who have a long history of convincing government to give approval and research funding gamed the structure to the deficit of sitting elected leadership in areas where the leadership has no subject area expertise then a pattern would surely be clearly illustrated with a timeline of interactions between administration officials and the experts that briefed them. Honestly if law exists for executive term limits there should be limits on the amount of time administrative executives can award or influence funding of governmental grants and research.

Honestly if the current administration and the select committee can request all communication records for the former president and members of the legislature for the January 6 2021 issue that affected possibly 2000 people then the standard of discovery for this type of information that affects literally billions of people should be paramount.

Though the knowledge or method to present these type of argument to the fine people who fund your mission may not be clear to this author, there may be a way to use this type of contrast in a survey or other fundraising issue to accomplish wider appeal for your organization beyond current demographics that you use to promote your organization. If the net can be widened and more people can understand that the people in these administrative positions that are largely not responsible to the electorate can mislead well intention-ed people on either side of the aisle then it becomes an American issue not a conservative or liberal issue. It can also become a world issue. The entire pandemic so far has an exercise in command and control by central governments and how far each government could push its populace in the name of public safety and emergency declaration. This has effectively illuminated not only problems in scientific consensus but the very nature of power and authority over dissent in the name of safety. This is why this is the most important timeline and issue to uncover in possibly the entirety of modern life. The intersection between information, safety, money, power, authority, society, freedom and autonomy all were impacted worldwide.

This is a republic if we can keep it. Many would argue that it hasn't been kept.

It is not a 'fake news' issue or a 'deception' issue. It is and should be a legal issue. Laws, both administrative and federal govern many of the processes and oaths of office are legal obligations.

This is a good time to do a post response review to uncover anomalies within the structure and ask questions on how to proceed with action. An organization such as Judicial Watch has the ability to understand through its unique experience exactly what types of information may be most useful in uncovering potential problems and paths to increase awareness that a bias or undue influence may exist. If that awareness allows the electorate on all sides and in the entire spectrum to identify as ALL versus us and them or right and left or rich and poor there might be a great mental 'reset' where all sides of elected officials are held accountable by the entire electorate.

If some in our society can argue for equity and privilege being important, there can be an equal argument on what the author believes should be coined appropriately as intellectual terrorism. A more polite way and less polarizing way to express this is that scientists, doctors and other professionals need to check their 'intellectual privilege' (as the left would say) when communicating with leaders and the public. Terms like inclusive and equitable, if those are indeed terms that some use as important objectives then it is incumbent for society to be intellectually inclusive and equitable. So often, experts agree on something that is later proven to be wrong. The smartest people in the room are often stumped by 'stupid' questions or even ridiculed for not understanding. The argument 'the science has changed', more information was learned does not negate the absolutism professed by these 'professionals' during the issuance of guidance. When the 'experts' exempt themselves in this way in a society that is based on rule of law and facts matter then that is equivalent to a defendant claiming ignorance of the law is and excuse for breaking it. In investment laws there are specific disclaimers for quarterly reports to protect against liability and investors against loss. We have audited financial statements. Why should health guidance with life and death consequences be less important?

The common diversionary tactics and debate tricks and parliamentary squabbles between supposed adults in the room neither accomplishes nor empowers anyone. Of course stating the obvious does not solve the problem either, it is the same, "criticism without a solution or reasonable alternative" and that is about as useless. America used to be about solutions not problems. My suggestion to your organization is to use as a core value to find reasonable alternatives to existing methods of engagement.

This leads to the reasons for voter roll verification and election integrity. All information or lack thereof is the basis for making an informed decision. If there is anything that is known about this country is innovation today is about gaming the system, pushing legal boundaries and exploiting loopholes to take advantage.

Determining whether there was integrity in the search for a solution during this pandemic is as important as the election integrity and the politicization of the disease in any way would affect the election including how, when and where we vote. If a 'whistle-blower' could cause a delay in the phase I/II trials of EIDD 2801 which ended up being the Merck therapeutic that was in the recent news it might be good to know whether the demotion of this person and his subsequent 'whistle-blower' retaliation against his superiors was motivated by science, administrative, personal or political objectives. Having this therapeutic earlier under EUA might have saved lives and given additional time to develop different medicines. So there are real 'administrative state' issues that are of interest to the American people. In medicine, malpractice can be proven by delay of treatment. What about political delay limiting availability of treatment or options? President Trump signed right to try to address a dire situation faced by many facing terminal illness. That was an indication of a non scientist being

practical and trusting individual physicians. After the election individual physicians were told not to prescribe therapeutics they had successfully used and had experience with. The message is resistance is futile. Disagree with the powers that be and be fired or sanctioned. Refuse to take the vaccine and lose your job. Put dissenting or contrary or op-positional information on a web page, blog or youtube video and be de-monetized (what google does to creators they do not agree by removing their revenue) and now de-platformed. To the administrative state this is about compliance, subservience and dependence.

This should be about rule of law.

A physician should have latitude to treat as best as they see fit with all reasonable available methods. Not providing individuals that are highly skilled and trained autonomy over their patients they are ethically and morally responsible for the ability to make best use of their training, not only insults their intelligence, it limits their freedom and autonomy. If one of those physicians who have been increasingly relegated to data entry clinicians that have to use a decision tree prescribed by an educated bureaucrat or HMO then we end up with less innovation in the field in medicine where everything is procedural and economic rather than value, education and effort based. This is no longer the case, medicine has become three options or less. It seems that everything in society is three options or less. This is not about choice or freedom. This is about scale. In our society everything is now scale. Has been since 2008, too big to fail. It is now 2021 and individual freedoms and equality are too small to succeed. The only hope left is the courts. The chasm between economic independence and dependence is wider than ever. Your mission in uncovering the corruption and inattention of people in our government is more important than ever.

In order to hold regulatory agencies and funding for trials accountable a contention could be made of either administrative malpractice or even worse abuse of power. If this country could entertain an impeachment of a president for abuse of power on the basis that was used then an argument could be made that chain of command surrounding funding of therapeutic agents and whether improper scoring of the potentially successful drugs or therapies were overlooked. The presidential doctrine was to score all possible existing drugs, potential drugs and drugs under development in parallel with the vaccine development. If anyone at any agency, including Dr Fauci suppressed any information or improperly scored a potential treatment that is malpractice or at least a violation of the physicians oath especially if there were doctors involved in the scoring. First do no harm means to the best of your ability, knowledge and experience. Suppressing known information can be argued to be causing harm. It is clear that medical guidance and disease messaging has become more political than it always was. This pandemic has laid bare the fears of most Americans about the medical and pharmaceutical industry. If information was suppressed by administrative actors to elected officials and their appointees then that is a problem that must be addressed with even more urgency than the disease itself. If people died defending our republic and the republic is based on elections and chain of command then it is important that our previous, current and future leaders have confidence that the people in the machinery of government do not provide false, untimely, incomplete or misleading information.

The fact that there are checks and balances in our government for a reason is exactly why there should be checks and balances in those employed by the federal government. They exist legally but are rarely enforced. Existing and future elected officials need to be confident that they will be supported regardless of dissenting political views. If past leadership including the past President were not served with correct and complete information and it could be proven that anyone gave less than their level and honest best during a time of crisis or anytime that is something that is as important as the ballot itself. Votes do not count if the structure that supports the elected officials do not follow objectives, intent and

legal authority of elected leaders.

Leaders depend on subordinates to provide proper information. If this proper information depends on political alignment then there needs to be a legal remedy. Former President Trump was in the process of making accountability and competence a requirement for continued employment at the federal level. The current administration is encouraging additional unionization among professional ranks. Unfortunately that does not lead to more individual accountability which is why now this should be researched and sooner than later. If there is not a culture of accountability then as many in the federal government contend, there will be a greater fiefdom tendency throughout the professional ranks. That neither serves nor improves the government, its leaders or the electorate. As many would contend that the practice of redistricting is gerrymandering, the effect of unionization as it exists and proposed to expand could easily render elections largely ineffectual to serve in intention of the voter giving the machinery of the government unchecked influence and power.

This is precisely, in the author's opinion, why Afghanistan had a high probability ending up as it did. A country, with various affiliated 'fiefdoms' and a corrupt elected system. The difference between people who believe and those who are paid to believe. Admittedly an oversimplification but it makes a distinction. People who can vote with their feet regardless of cost and those who cannot because of it. In our society there is less ability to vote with your feet because of the risks outweigh the benefits for most.

As with voter rolls, the American people deserve to know if their government is working for them.

Another issue that has been learned that algorithms and the technology companies that comprise the largest audience were changed before, during and after the elections. We know this from whistleblowers both at Google, Facebook and other technology companies. This alters what information people receive when trying understand any given subject and makes it more difficult for people to make informed decisions.

It would be useful to sue these technology companies to enable discovery of what was changed, how and when in their filtering of information. It may be the purview of the congress to require this but there are times when an action taken can provide a cause that the electorate to lobby elected officials to investigate. These may be private companies but they operate in the public square and are widely adopted. Just as there is legislation around truth in advertising and there are already laws on the books for listing of ingredients contained in our food, the public should have the right to an understandable and public list of exactly how information is filtered and what formulas are used to derive results that users see both on their searches and their social media feeds or auto-suggestions during searches. This may be outside of your mission or scope but there are election laws and since these companies have legal teams and patent all kinds of innovations so it would be reasonable to assume that they could indeed foresee how potential changes in their filtering mechanisms could influence values and decisions by its users. That is essentially how they make money, by showing advertisers they can deliver sales and traffic and therefore customers. The actual pricing structure is related to how popular a keyword or topic is at any given time among other factors. Considering an election cycle has polls over time in areas and defined schedules leading up to election day it might be most important to determine when algorithms were changed and how that stacks up against polling. If they have acted either unknowingly or knowingly to influence by restriction or weighting through changes in their filtering mechanism during an election cycle that should be acted upon or at least known by the voting public. If this information is widely known in simple, digestible form it could allow the general public to have a healthy skepticism on news feeds and may garner more support for first amendment rights.

Section 230 may exempt online publishers for liability in terms of content moderation. Arguments can be made for and against this series of exemptions but the greater point is that advertising is presented within this context. Liability is different than responsibility. People understand this that a profile for each user is being created and the search engines and social feeds 'adapt' to service and anticipate the needs of the user base. While this may be a noble and useful thing, it is akin to subliminal advertising that was outlawed in movie theaters long ago. Considering that not all people have the same lexicon or language usage and that commonly used search terms being individually treated in a globally manner for all users changing results. There are laws for truth in labeling and the reasonable man argument is that what is typed in a search box is treated as a search. There are no disclaimers or lists of terms that have special treatment, nor an explanation that this is happening..

People may notice creepy advertising and other evidence of knowledge of their online habits, but would not notice nuanced preferences towards types of content of positive or negative that are global in nature,

Imagine if you put dog in a search engine and results showed negative articles on dogs, but if you put cat in the same search box you saw positive articles. This would show an obvious bias and the 'reasonable man' would see that. Indeed research has shown that this was the case in autosuggestion, search results and social media as to political issues but it is not as obvious in the way it occurs.

Research has found that hidden, short messages can change behavior. There are many legal areas in terms of consumer safety that are completely exempted for technology. Subliminal advertising in its infancy was a form of new technology and planned to manipulate a captive audience. It worked so well that the practice was outlawed. In current times a search engine or social media company can knowingly or even without their intention create a 'network effect'. They may recognize this internally and try to compensate for bias. There are disclosures through industry whistle-blowers to their process and recognition of this and plans to 'compensate' for bias. But globally compensating for bias assumes that the method and reasoning is perfect and correct. It cannot be.

The very fact that this is recognized and can be exploited is exactly the reason not to act specifically surrounding those issues. The argument that is being made here is that exploitation would be obvious to users, while 'correcting' for this through an arbitrary process outside of the users knowledge base of how the product works in addition to not informing the user that the keyword, search, or new feed items are treated differently than before. Each person is different and has an ultimate goal that is unknown to the company providing the information. Influencing behavior or 'steering' people in a world where much of the 'sale' is not popcorn or cola at a theater but rather sale of a decision and presentation of available options. This could encourage someone to vote or to dissuade them from voting or even why or who to vote for. Filtering a response or altering algorithms over time without knowledge is in effect subliminal advertising. These are complex mechanisms understood by few but affecting many. Subtle changes over time can give the user the impression that they made a decision objectively without influence. This has been proven again and again that subtle changes change behavior. There is a whole of marketing science relating to product placement in a store such that manufacturers of products pay for placement. If the product of commonly used keywords are treated differently during an election cycle. If these changes were paired alongside other political actions funded by owners, controllers or other stakeholders (e.g. Zuckerberg funding nonprofit vote canvassing) the timing of changes, choices of where to canvass, etc could be coordinated to influencing an election without disclosure This is political action and influencing without disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. Regardless of election outcome, this goes far beyond just ballot harvesting and

political activism. What in the historical context of grassroots organizing this is digital root organizing. The difference is it is scale-able, ubiquitous and does not involve boots on the ground. It is akin to a drone strike politically, has a specific target (issue or politician) and ends up with collateral damage to society.

As a country it was discovered recently in Afghanistan that technology cannot solve all problems. It takes cohesion, force of will and strength in purpose. In our technologically dependent society when even prior leadership can be effectively silenced and when enormous wealth comes with even larger arrogance there a need for rule of law is even more important. Regulatory addition and new oversight and laws are not what the society needs, given the additional cost and complexity that is easily afforded by the large technocrats of our society.

China has shown us that they are willing to crack down on big technocrats quickly because they have seen what has happened here. This is bigger than the internet, this is about values. We value freedom but at this point, where a tweet can change the value of anything, we should act boldly regardless of the financial consequences to one sector.

For instance there are racketeering laws, there are anti-trust laws and there are anti-competitive laws. The enforcement of these laws has been ineffective since the amount of money that is allocated to fighting these type of actions or policing this activity is too small to compete with the war chests of the technology companies, who have highly paid full time legal staff amounting to an army of paperwork creators resulting in hundred page user agreements that exempt them from liability, loss of use and damages. If a car company could have the liability exclusions that technology companies enjoy, cars would be as safe as the internet. They would also be as inexpensive to the user and as costly to society. We are regressing towards single points of failure. A diverse populace is not made up of genders or identities. A diverse economy is not made up of traders, importers, exporters and algorithms. A truly inclusive society is tolerant of dissent.

Recently the media focus has been on social media companies optimizing for polarizing content. This misses the point. These companies, through changing master rules before and after an election without revealing to users the date of such change is at best a dishonest attempt to serve its users. But the realistic and observable truth is that the changes were deliberate, affecting results without letting users know. It would have been easy for these companies to tell users that results could change and why and allow them to determine whether it was in the users best interest to continue to rely on those products. This would be akin buying a product at the store, opening the package and seeing something different in the box than in past purchases. The difference cannot be observed easily but it is the same thing.

It may not be codified in laws at this point but if we are all equal under the law and as a value we believe in as a society then we should demand transparency of the methods for presentation of information, especially when it relates to the most important decision people can make as an electorate.

We do know that filter lists at Google were changed and auto-suggestions were changed as well as priority rankings. There were insiders that sent that information out.

A company like Facebook, Google or Twitter, among others has demographic, psychographic and other proprietary information on its users that give them an ability to serve their users as well as cross reference what competitors or potential competitors to acquire. They know what their users believe, think, their values, opinions and political leanings. In the case of Facebook they also know age and location. If that influence can be effectively used to sell advertising that advertisers are willing to pay

for then that same information can be used to provide influence in matters of legislation, election and political action. If those same entities can choose how to influence their users and reinforce their wants and needs it could be argued that is their mission as a corporation. But that proprietary in house information and the ability to data mine and use that information along with publicly available voting districting information allows an exponential advantage in an election cycle. A company like Facebook also knows connections between people, degrees of separation and location as well as all communications posted through their platform. In increasingly close elections this amounts to entrance polling versus exit polling.

A good illustration would be a phone book or a physical library. If you went to a physical library you would have a index the items in the catalog of information. A company that provides a search engine has the entire word contents of the entire phone book and the word contents of every book in the entire library. They have a complete index. If they choose to provide results based on a best guess only that would be one thing. The problem is they have complete information and choose preference or filter.

Using special rules for just political candidates or specific keywords that may relate to an election cycle is essentially creating artificial inferences intentionally. That is their right as a company, but, as an information provider changing priority in an election cycle is problematic though probably legal, because it is their algorithm and filtering rules. The problem is the timing and lack of knowledge by the user base that this is happening.

Insider information at Google showed a clear political objective. Legality of this aside, not disclosing political objectives to users, especially when the market share percentage is greater than the percentage required to win an election is problematic at best. If you changed what the ingredients were in any food product it would change the end product. Are there websites that are not included in this search? What are your blacklists and rationale for them. Are there results, that are known to you, that are purposely omitted? The fact that some subjects and keywords are given 'special' treatment by a human decided list of terms means that the results are treated differently and presented differently. The bottom line, which is well known is that these companies have data collection methods and analytical capabilities beyond the average person to understand. They realize this and actively try to manage bias. But managing bias is still a form of bias.

The point is results are presented as objective based on interest, keyword search and history. That is the represented product. Having certain terms treated differently in a global manner affects all results especially during a time when people are making a political decision during a crisis. It is still not widely known that auto-suggestions and auto-completes were purposely biased. The rules and exceptions are not disclosed in a meaningful and transparent way. It could be argued that giving that information could be a threat to their trade secrets. Subliminal advertising was a trade secret as well, until it was not.

In conclusion the short take on the issues raised that I think your organization should pursue (or continue to pursue) are:

1. Determining when and what happened surrounding Coronavirus and whether there is a potential link between PCR cycle numbers and standards used to either under or over report cases and deaths and when and if linkage could be attributed to polling numbers and political sentiment. Masking, social distancing and numbers of cycles versus infection/hospitalization rates compared to what areas could be a good way to make initial inferences. This query could frame a good argument for action through your network that would be beneficial to be able to

investigate legally.

2. Determination of whether therapeutic options were either actively suppressed or discouraged within organizations, whether research that showed statistical promise were overlooked and what the rationale was behind those decisions. Determination of how or whether doctors were bullied, sanctioned or otherwise harmed as a result of dissent from any governmental agency and what the rationale was for such harm.
3. Spearheading a cause for action around whether there was a coordinated conflict of interest surrounding filter, news feed, and algorithms by technology companies that were subsequently changed before, during or after the election cycle. Researching out potential linkages between charitable donations to canvassing and other political organizations based on area (district) and polling numbers. Attempting to subpoena or contacting congress in the fact finding mission to uncover if the companies ownership or management used internal, proprietary demographic information to act effectively as a PAC without registration of being a PAC.
4. Determination of what information could potentially improve FOIA requests surrounding administrative actions and directives before and during the pandemic in relation to the election cycle and the development of treatments, reporting and vaccine development to illustrate to the American people flaws or potential conflicts of interest as well as potential crimes that would allow for a better platform to drive membership and donations with the additional positive ability for more people to understand the mission of your organization and the potential value it can provide society. This could help the administrative structure provide better value for taxpayer support.
5. Hiring or finding volunteers in the data mining, AI and deep learning technologies that could shed further light on how the nexus of search, social networking, economics and politics can give out-sized significance to fringe issues that affect a small portion of the population and be used as a divisive wedge separating people and using them for political and economic advantage.

The challenges your organization faces are very real. Unfortunately most newly wealthy technology leaders (and even retired ones) have a different frame of reference when it comes to what could be termed as relative morality. With the amount of proprietary knowledge of both their users and society in general as well as the ability to coordinate and aggregate information quickly and effectively they are at a natural advantage in their ability to use both their internal information and their vast wealth to accomplish their goals. That is their right but it should be exposed just as campaign contributions have to be disclosed.

While the population does not have their altitude in terms of vision they deserve more credible information. Most of these corporations are the size of countries and if we have radio free Europe to fight communism we should have corporate free internet to defend Americans. The scale of their enterprises and ability to secure themselves legally and digitally makes even our government at their mercy. When a company such as Google can pick and choose what technology which government can have that is even more dangerous from the outsiders perspective. There is no way to know the real truth and Americans know that.

Again, if I was not myself in severe need of funding and in good standing financially I would extend my membership. I am only ashamed that I am not a productive American, nor likely to be in the future. But I do wish you all the success in your goals to hold those who feel they are above the law

accountable. If the structures that harmed me last year were held accountable the resources would be available to show support for your organization.

This letter is to show my support for your mission. It is deeply personal, private and conveys a great degree of trust. Best wishes for success in fighting the good fight and the strength to do so.

.

Sincerely,

Mark P. McGoldrick